SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VII, No. 19 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 November, 15, 1977

How They Picked (or Didn't) a New OTA Chief

In an essay titled "The Short List," the originator of Parkinson's Law wrote that when major administrative positions are to be filled, the selection process often becomes so confused that eventually "all the applications are thrown into the waste-paper basket, only one candidate being considered, and he a man who did not apply."

With exactitude, this is the process that has been followed in selecting a new director for the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), a post for which 219 candidates had been culled to a short list of nine, which did not include the winner: former Delaware Governor Russell W. Peterson, who chaired the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) from 1973 to 1976. Since then, Peterson, who was formerly a chemist with the DuPont Co., has been serving as president of an organization called New Directions, an internationally oriented version of Common Cause.

But to make the OTA saga even more baroque, there is no certainty, as of this writing, that Peterson will, in fact, become director of OTA. The reason is that when all the other candidates had declined or been cast aside, and Peterson was approached, he agreed to be considered, but on the condition that he wouldn't promise beforehand to accept an offer, since he would have to discuss the matter with his colleagues at his fledgling organization.

Europe Settles its Biggest R&D Pork-Barrel Fight — Page 4

When the offer was made, late last month, Peterson was traveling in India, and apparently was beyond the reach of the news from OTA. He's due back any day now, and OTA is awaiting his decision.

The offer to Peterson, which comes from OTA's 12-member House-Senate board, has been well received all around — except at New Directions — for, in terms of professional training and career experience, he appears to be ideal for the troubled agency. A Ph.D. chemist from the University of Wisconsin, he became director of DuPont's research and development division during a 26-year career with the firm. From 1969 to 1973, he held the governorship, and was widely respected for his performance as chairman of the CEQ, especially during the difficult final innings of the Nixon Administration.

And to top it off, he's a Republican. In regard to ideology and policy, that probably means very little. But it should be recalled that when OTA's founding director, Emilio Q. Daddario, suddenly resigned last summer, charges flew around to the effect that OTA Board Chairman Edward Kennedy had turned the agency into his own political job shop. The charges were far-fetched, but got a lot of currency when Rep. Marjorie Holt (R-Md.), one of the more fuzzy-minded members of the OTA operation, suddenly quit, claiming that Kennedy was dominating the organization to the exclusion of her own participation.

Kennedy responded by proposing to replace Daddario through a selection process designed to guarantee against political contamination. Thus, the world at large was invited to nominate themselves or others. All names were screened by the Civil Service Commission, though for what purpose is not clear, since the Commission normally has nothing to do with Congressional staff appointments. Then the names were screened by OTA's Advisory Council, chaired by MIT President Jerome Wiesner, and, finally, a short list of names — Peterson

(Continued on Page 2)

In Print

The budget that President Carter will send to Congress next January will be extremely tight, according to James T. McIntyre, acting director of the Office of Management and Budget. "The amount of spending growth will be small compared with previous years," McIntyre said in a recent talk, adding that he has instructed the OMB staff "to keep the lid on."

Presidential Science Adviser Frank Press turned up in the November 7 New York Times *inexplicably identified as "a winner of the Nobel Prize for physics." Press, who has won many prizes, but not that one, has been receiving congratulations ever since. The next day, the* Times *attributed the "award" to an "editing error."*

Britain's government-encouraged experiment with cigarettes containing cellulose-based tobacco substitutes is a flop. Sales have been so poor that the companies manufacturing the supposedly less-hazardous version are planning to destroy a stockpile of 100 million cigarettes.

The Department of Energy has awarded Auburn University $98,000 to study the design of wood-burning stoves and fireplaces. "The Auburn work," says an announcement, "is one of a number of projects planned by DOE in this field."

...Then OTA Chucked Away the Short List

(Continued From Page 1)

not among them — was submitted to the Congressional board, which interviewed nine of them.

What happened then is not clear. But apparently the finalists either said, no, thanks, or failed to arouse much enthusiasm — at which point, Senator Clifford Case (R-NJ) validated Parkinson's short-list thesis by suggesting the candidates on hand be jettisoned and the job offered to Peterson, with whom he is long acquainted.

Peterson then met with Case and Kennedy, and following a meeting with the board, it was unanimously agreed to offer him the job — at which point he was out of the country.

If he does accept the directorship, he will be taking over an agency that has become an object of contention and puzzlement. Even allowing for the difficulty of educating a harried Congress about the potential of technology assessment, the fact is that after four years of operations, OTA is still not well known on Capitol Hill. But to the extent that its presence is recognized, it has generated a fair amount of hostility. The powers that control money for Congressional staff recently directed it to cut its staff from 155 to 130, and, at a time when some budgetary growth is needed just to stand still, OTA's budget was trimmed by $400,000, to a total of $8.5 million for the current fiscal year. These cuts came with directives for OTA to get its house in order, but, as has usually been the case with OTA's critics, specifics were lacking.

A lot of the contention swirls around the issue of the balance that OTA should seek in in-house as compared with contracted-out studies. So far, the bulk of OTA's work, which is almost exclusively for Congressional committees, has been assigned to outside study groups. If that's the pattern, some Congressmen ask, why does OTA require well over 100 staff members?

The reply is that the staff does perform some studies on its own, but, beyond that, it helps formulate questions for contractors, monitors their progress, and assists in shaping up the results and conveying them to people who requested the study. Few Congressmen, however, are familiar with this laborious process, which conflicts sharply with the hurry-up-and-get-it-out-quick system that prevails in their own offices and on their committees.

Assuming that Peterson accepts the directorship, his stature at least assures that OTA will be given a generous opportunity to develop a satisfactory relationship with the Congress. Daddario, a former Representative, was supposed to be looking after that task, but by many accounts he was so concerned with avoiding any offense to Congressional mandarins that OTA came across with a pallid image. On top of that, the internal

(Continued on Page 3)

New Direction: Up the Wall

The staff and board of New Directions, which has been having a rough startup period, are not the least bit pleased about Russell Peterson's dickerings with the Office of Technology Assessment. Though nothing has been said publicly, a lot of them, in fact, are outraged that Peterson would even consider bailing out of the organization in this early and vulnerable period of its existence.

Founded in October 1976 by a group that included lots of well-known do-gooders, such as Norman Cousins, Margaret Mead, and Father Hesburgh, New Directions considered itself fortunate to sign on Peterson as its first president. Well-known and respected in government circles, Peterson was seen as an asset for building the organization's public image and for raising funds. Money raising, however, costs money, and for this purpose, New Directions has borrowed $80,000 for direct-mail fund-raising appeals. So far, SGR has been told, the results have not been exhilirating. The organization, with a full-time staff of eight, now numbers about 10,000 members. Membership fees range from $10 to $25.

According to one staff member, Peterson is so closely identified with the organization now, that his departure might be disastrous.

©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1977

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Pamela Moore

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London)
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report*, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $75 (two years, $140); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Commerce Eyes New Industry R&D Link

The Commerce Department, graveyard of many schemes for assisting American industry, is working up a plan to respond to foreign competition by promoting closer collaboration between the National Bureau of Standards (NBS) and industrial research organizations.

This time, the key word is "infratechnology," defined by Jordan Baruch, the Department's assistant secretary for science and technology, as "that underlying set of techniques and capabilities on which individual firms can build actual products and processes that make them competitive."

In testimony October 25 before the House Science and Technology Committee, Baruch said the NBS plan is tentatively titled the Cooperative Technology Program. He also said that "Initial implementation of this program, however, must await completion of a formal review and approval process, " which suggests that it still must survive departmental review before entering the mine fields of the Office of Management and Budget and assorted Congressional committees.

Recently returned from a three-week visit to the People's Republic of China, Baruch said that the Chinese "are still behind us in technical competence, but even that gap is closing fast." As for major industrial competitors, he said they "are catching up because thay have made catching up a matter of national commitment."

"Germany," he noted, "has a major national program going on in automated parts manufacturing; Japan is in the process of investing over $300 million in the basic technology of large-scale integrated circuits." The Chinese, he added, are "busy designing and experimenting with solid-state electronic telephone exchanges."

Baruch said that in the past US industry was not confronted by such competitive efforts and was easily able to maintain a lead. "Under these new changed circumstances," he continued, "there is a need for a new federal role, involving the National Bureau of Standards as well as other agencies that can contribute to the development of infratechnology." But since Baruch's jurisdiction is confined to agencies within the Department of Commerce, he simply said that "If it is eventually decided that the Federal Government should increase its role in infratechnology development, I believe the Bureau [of Standards] will be called upon to play a special part with regard to the support of those infratechnologies not falling within the purview of the mission agencies."

The program, he said, "would be built upon cooperation between government and industry and have as its purpose the development of new knowledge, prototype technology, and mechanisms that will promote the generation, improvement, transfer, and application of technologies. Projects would be conducted only in those cases where the private sector, acting alone, cannot or will not do the job, and where there is strong demand among users for solving the problem or exploiting the opportunity."

Baruch added that "in developing our proposal we have had as a goal increased mobility of Bureau scientists and engineers between the laboratory and the development projects. Both research and common sense tell us that ideas are transferred most effectively by the motion of people rather than by paper."

Hearing of the proposed program, veterans of the Washington scene will recall that a similar effort was tried during the Kennedy Administration — under the title of the Civilian Industrial Technology Program (CIT) — only to be mutilated in Congress. CIT, however, suffered from a number of misfortunes that are no longer on the scene, among them John Rooney, an influential Brooklyn waterfront Congressman who was obsessed with the notion that the aim of the program was to automate the docks and put his constituents out of work.

At that time, too, industry wasn't hurting as badly as it is now. Furthermore, a federal presence in many aspects of American life and business is now taken for granted, even if it isn't liked, whereas in the early 1960s, many basic industries had little or no dealings with federal officials. In present circumstances of devastating foreign competition, oldline industries, such as steel and shoe manufacture, are likely to be more receptive to

(Continued on Page 4)

PETERSON

(Continued From Page 2)

operations of the organization were generally said to be chaotic under the former director. OTA staff members routinely complained of being kept in the dark about what was going on elsewhere in the agency, staff meetings were almost non-existent, and, in general, there was little sense of being part of an orchestrated whole.

Gripes of this sort are commonplace in organizations and are difficult to evaluate. But in the few months that Deputy Director Daniel De Simone has been serving as Acting Director, OTA morale has picked up considerably. Staff members praise De Simone for such simple things as organizing staff seminars and producing an internal newsletter.

Whether De Simone stays on remains to be seen. He said earlier that if asked to remain, he'll give it a try, but was not certain about his plans. —DSG

Pork Barrel, European Style: JET Reactor Finally Lands

The European Economic Community — the Common Market — has just concluded a long-raging, American-style pork-barrel fight over the location of the largest research project ever undertaken by the nine-nation alliance, the $210-million Joint European Torus (JET) fusion machine. Mike Kenward reports from London on some of the bizarre ins and outs of that struggle:

Two years ago, the Nine agreed that JET should be built. Ever since, they've been haggling and pouting over *where* it should be built, with the final decision going to Culham, near Oxford, in England.

The Nine should have made up their minds to start building the machine at the beginning of the EEC's 1976-1980 R&D program but things just did not work out that way. In the end it took a confrontation between the British and West German prime ministers to clear away the obstacles, and in the process of winning the project, Britain discovered that the price of butter can have a lot to do with choosing where to build an important energy research project.

The project started in 1973 when the EEC hired a team to design a new large machine that would be the next stage in fusion research. The team, based at the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority's Culham Laboratory — which is devoted solely to plasma physics and fusion research — had just about finished its work in 1975, certainly in time for the EEC's research ministers to decide what to do about the device and the rest of the Common Market's fusion research program.

JET was much bigger and more expensive than anything that had gone before. So while the EEC had been running a very successful fusion effort, with different countries building a variety of machines as a part of a coordinated program, the Nine now had to come together to build a single machine. There was little argument about whether or not to build JET — the EEC's members wanted to stay active in fusion research but no country could afford to go it alone with a project then estimated to cost around $150 million — but where was it to be built?

The Commission of the Common Market — the Brussels-based EEC civil service — created the first major snag when it said that JET should be built at its own Joint Research Centre at Ispra, in Italy. Poorly thought of throughout the European research community, Ispra had next to no fusion expertise and a poor labor-relations record — the latter was partly due to the EEC's own inability to find something useful for Ispra to do when the establishment's original task of building a European nuclear reactor collapsed in nationalistic dissension.

Showing a unaminity that was never to be repeated, everyone, with the understandable exception of Italy, agreed that JET would never be built at Ispra. But the Commission persisted and it wasn't until November 1976 that it realized that it would have to back down if the project were to go ahead.

At the end of 1976, Culham, along with Garching, in Bavaria, West Germany, were the favored sites, with France's Cadarache research establishment a poor third. The French response was a Cadarache-or-nowhere position. Other EEC members responded against this so violently that France withdrew completely from the race.

Both Britain and West Germany adopted the outwardly reasonable line that they would go along with a majority decision on a site for JET; but both worked hard to ensure that if ever their site looked like a loser, the issue would be kept from a vote. After months of diplomatic to-ing and fro-ing, by March of this year it looked as if the arguing would soon be over, with Britain the winner, thanks partly to a feeling that even if Culham and Garching were equally suitable in scientific terms it was about time that the UK had a chance to house a major EEC institution.

Unfortunately the meeting of the EEC research ministers that was expected to make a decision took place on the day after an extremely bitter meeting of the agriculture ministers of the Nine. At this meeting, Britain stood alone in pushing for a farm policy to hold down prices paid to farmers by reducing, for example, the subsidies on butter production. (The Common Agriculture Policy is possibly the most important, and most bitterly fought over, creation of the EEC). With butter bitterness in the air, the chairman of the research council — Britain was taking its turn to chair EEC council meetings for six months — managed to keep the JET issue from a vote that would almost certainly have gone against Culham by a large majority.

(Continued on Page 5)

COMMERCE

(Continued From Page 3)

an offer of federal technological assistance.

Still to be resolved, however, are the difficult problems of anti-trust regulations that frown on industrial collaboration, as well as the problems of proprietary interest. "Infratechnology" conveys a suggestion of knowledge useful on an available-to-all comers basis. But some firms are better equipped than others to make use of new developments, and therein may be a problem that could lead to charges of special preferences, which, in turn, could provoke a political backlash.

Showing industry how to save itself is no easy matter.

...Mixing R&D with Butter and Anti-Terrorist Aid

JET *(Continued From Page 4)*

This episode occured in June, just before the EEC packed up shop for the summer. The recess saw little progress and things didn't look very promising when the EEC's foreign ministers met in October. But their get-together coincided with a visit by British Prime Minister Callaghan to Bonn. Callaghan, who has shown a more than usual personal interest in JET, pushed Culham's case and his arguments won over the West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt; so a call went out to the Luxembourg meeting of the foreign ministers that the final obstacles had been removed and that there could be an early decision on JET. And everyone predicted that Culham was going to be the winner. Callaghan however, had made same representations to Schmidt before, so why would the West German Chancellor give way this time, which he did?

Various theories have been offered to explain the change of heart. To begin with, Britain agreed that West Germany would, over the next three years, stop contributing to the cost of maintaining British army units in West Germany. And it may have been no coincidence that the two heads of state met immediately after the West Germans had rescued a hijacked plane, with considerable technical assistance from British specialists.

Whatever the reasons for the sudden agreement, the outcome was that Schmidt agreed to go along with a majority decision on JET. So a week after the two met, an uncharacteristically brief meeting of the EEC's research ministers finally chose Culham as the home of the project. There wasn't actually a vote on the two sites at the meeting. Instead the Belgian chairman took each delegation aside and asked what site it preferred. He then told the ministers the result of this referendum and they voted unanimously to go along with the majority decision. In the end five countries favored Culham (France, Holland, Eire, Denmark, and Britain), two favored Garching (Luxembourg and West Germany), and two abstained (Italy and Belgium).

With these unnecessary delays behind them it is hardly surprising that the scientists who designed JET were less than ecstatic when they heard the news. However, they put on a brave face and tried to pretend that the delays had not been a complete waste of time, although the EEC's indecisiveness led a third of the original 50-man design team to find jobs elsewhere.

During the two years or more since the designers completed the basic JET plans, they have been refining it; they even squeezed enough money out of the EEC to build prototypes of some of the crucial components. Thanks to this limited work, the JET team is confident that the machine can be built on schedule and within the budget. Some JET workers have pointed out that while the US has already started work on the Princeton Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor the Princeton team isn't clear on some crucial design aspects. And the Europeans have always claimed that JET will be a more sophisticated and scientifically advanced machine than TFTR.

NIH Head on Economics of Biomedical Research

What's in store for the National Institutes of Health in the Carter era of tight budgets and reshuffling of government priorities? NIH Director Donald Fredrickson, a Ford appointee retained by HEW Secretary Joseph Califano to keep NIH on an even keel after several years of political turbulence (SGR Vol. VII, No. 3), addressed himself to these issues in an address October 25 to the Institute of Medicine. Following are some key portions from his text built around questions that he posed "about the immediate economics of biomedical science in America":

Is it likely that we will return to a parochial period, where resources will be derived primarily from private sources?

The answer is most assuredly negative. The Federal government has not become disinterested in or disenchanted with science. Its short-range health priorities, however, do not place science first. Immediate problems have higher priority: health-care cost-containment, access to care, and full utilization of existing modes of prevention. If acquisition of knowledge is last, it is not a poor fourth, for the need for improved knowledge is one of the imperatives in achieving the other goals.

Are we headed for another period of exuberant growth or unselective expansion?

The answer, I suspect, is equally negative, although it is neither popular nor politically wise to say so. The reasons are basically economic, but not solely matters of competition for limited federal funds. A drop in school-age children will bring curtailment of university expansion. We are currently experiencing an uncertain and somewhat unguided change in the pattern of medical education which de-emphasizes subspecialization, a necessary component of vigorous biomedical research.

(Continued on Page 6)

...The Strategies for Future Funding at NIH

NIH *(Continued From Page 5)*

Although medical school enrollment has increased 50 per cent in the last 10 years, the scientific endeavor in the academic health centers has not expanded in any like proportion. There are clear signs that the always small fraction of medical school graduates interested in research as a professional career is, at least momentarily, diminished — and one reason is deep concern about the stability of support for such a career... And we are groping for ways to attract young minds to...hitherto less-romantic sectors of scientific inquiry, which desperately need further development....

The promise of "conventional" research is not diminished by other demands but can grow in proportion to an ever-widening knowledge base. A loss of vigor in that capability for inquiry created during earlier periods of expansion can prove very costly to mankind. Ways to maintain it that provide selective growth and desirable compensatory attrition must be our minimun objectives.

* * * * *

If maintenance implies increasing selectivity, what are the future funding strategies?

The answer to this question is a compound one. One part I would consider as the strategies of science *in* society — the political imperatives. The other I would call the institutional imperatives, which concern the allocation of resources for conduct of scientific inquiry.

There must be practical, useful development emerging from health science. These inventions must subordinate palliation to prevention and not be offered in ignorance or indifference to their economic or other social consequences....NIH has made a commitment on behalf of its medical constituents to engage seriously the social responsibilities hidden beneath the jargon of "technology transfer," "technology consensus," "technology assessment," and "demonstration and validation."

[In regard to institutional strategies]...demands for precision in priorities exceed by a great deal the capability for totally rational management of both laboratory and clinical sciences...The expansion of knowledge has its own dynamic — especially in the complex and still relatively primitive biosciences...Discovery in science cannot be legislated or ordered by the courts.

While there is thus a narrow limit to the rational management of science through the allocation of resources, there are...areas in which such an approach — and some controls — can, and should, operate.

The first is in the distribution between sectors of biology and medicine, between different disciplines and diseases. Allocations here should come from a blend of assessments of social need and technical opportunity.

The second is the distribution between applied research activities within a sector or discipline...How does one choose between improving the life expectency of someone with cancer today against the prevention of cancer tomorrow? Different perspectives offer different decisions and each must be tempered by the expert's clouded estimates of the probabilities of success...

The third institutional strategy is the allocation of funds between different mechanisms of support. I am of the conviction that somewhere here lies the solution to the cryptic puzzle of what is "basic" and what is "applied" science...The best approach to this problem...lies through an appreciation of the sociology of science, and a disregard of some of the distinctions existing among instruments by which research is supported...To me, there are, in fact, two kinds of grants — small grants and large grants. The first support a scientist and the basics he needs to pursue a goal which he has initiated. It is in the nature of science...that some individuals are entrepreneurial and will exercise greater creativity in larger settings. These, whether partnerships or sections or larger laboratories, may best thrive under "program projects" or other forms of larger grants....

[The complete text of Fredrickson's talk, "Health Science: Status Report," is available without charge from the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014).

Send a Colleague A Free Copy of SGR

Return to:
SGR Box 6226B
Washington, D.C. 20015

If you have a colleague who might be interested in *Science & Government Report*, we'd be pleased to send him/her a recent issue, at no charge.
Please send to:

Name _____

Address _____ Zip_____

At the suggestion of _____

Scientists Converge for Moon's Conference

With all expenses paid for some 500 scientists and scholars of one sort or another from around the world, the Rev. Sun Myung Moon will be packing 'em in again at his sixth annual International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences, Thanksgiving weekend in San Francisco.

As usual, the Moon front that runs this show, the International Cultural Foundation, is boasting of a star-studded cast, with the Nobel laureate contingent placed at 10. This is a dropoff from the 17 that attended the 1974 conference, in London, and the 11 at the 1975 pow wow, in New York, But the trend is up from the seven Nobelists who showed up at the Washington meeting last year.

In any case, some of the better-known participants on this year's program are Sir John Eccles and Princeton's Eugene Wigner, both Nobel laureates; Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago; Alexander King, a veteran of international science-policy circles and a founding member of the Club of Rome; and Karl H. Pribram, of Stanford.

The Cultural Foundation, which is supported by Moon's Unification Church, said the conference is budgeted at $400,000. A spokesman for the Foundation explained to SGR that the money is for travel, room and board, and honoraria "of a few hundred dollars" for those who deliver papers.

The origins of Moon's affluence are not a matter of public record, but a good deal of it obviously comes from streetcorner collections by so-called Moonies; he is also reported to be the beneficiary of some South Korean sweatshops and to have close links to the South Korean government.

In past years, Moon was kept more or less out of sight when the Foundation issued invitations for the conference, but when his presence became known, a number of invitees angrily dropped out, alleging that they had been mislead about the sponsorship (SGR Vol. V, No. 14). This year, his involvement has been openly stated.

As for the motives for this improbable linkup of the controversial reverend and many superstars of academe — well, that's a matter of some debate. Some participants candidly acknowledge, though not for attribution, that they're interested in nothing more than a free trip to an attractive place. Others, such as Wigner, insist that the "unification of the sciences" is an important subject, and that Moon is the only patron willing to foot the costs of a big international get-together. Furthermore, they point out, he keeps hands off, and limits his own participation to a short, innocuous address. Such, fact, appears to be the case.

Moon insists, naturally, that the conference is in harmony with his campaign for "unifying" just about everything. No doubt it is, but the presence of so many academic luminaries is currently the only bit of positive publicity available for his tattered image.

Choice Dialog from Meeting on Unity of Sciences

What do they talk about at the Rev. Moon's annual International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences?

Conference literature indicates that the subject matter is not hedged by strict boundries. A press release from the sponsoring International Cultural Foundation states that "Discussions will center around establishing a standard of value in science and bringing together the fields of science with religion and philosophy." It's also stated that "Reverend Moon initiated these events to start a dialog among different fields of study so that critical social problems might be solved."

Not uncharacteristic is the following dialog, from proceedings of the 1973 conference, in Tokyo, between Erich Jantsch, then a visiting professor at the Technical University of Denmark, and Sir John Eccles, then of the State University of New York, Buffalo:

Jantsch: . . .emptying ourselves of the linguistic and analytical ability gives us the possibility of becoming conscious — you may call it subconsciously conscious, but conscious in a way that it works and acts on our consciousness — of the holistic view which I think, just as an idea, would tie in then very much also with the notions that the mind is not, as you in your last sentence said, let us say, the universe is not as you say it, mindless; but that we all share, as Aldous Huxley has put it, that we are all mind at large in some way. So that we share in some mind and I think I cannot elaborate this more here, but I think there are certain new results coming out, even in physics, which seem to indicate that there is something like a process of evolution which is not mindless but which goes on from the physical, what we call the inanimate world all the way to the social-cultural."

Eccles: "Thank you very much. I am going to get a bit lost, you know, in all the detailed answering. I think I agree with you almost completely. I think we should start to communicate more. You will be in Committee One, I think, will you not?"

Jantsch: "Unfortunately, I am in Committee Two."

Senator Issues Annual Guide to Federal Advisers

Senator Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.) has issued his fifth annual Who's Who of government advisers, a 4831-page tome listing 23,375 members of 1159 advisory groups of one sort or another, as of the end of last year.

The Senator, who chairs the Governmental Operations Subcommittee on Reports, Accounting and Management, reports that some organizations have numerous representatives serving as government advisers, and that some individuals serve on many advisory groups. But he offers no guidance on what conclusions are to be drawn from a finding, for example, that in one year, the advisory committee memberships of the League of Women Voters declined from 25 to 15.

As has been the case in past years, big universities, especially statewide systems, rank high as homebase for government advisers.

Index to the Membership of Federal Advisory Committees is available without charge to the press and public interest groups. Order from the Governmental Affairs Committee, US Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Others may obtain copies for $11.75 each from the US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Specify Stock No. 052-070-04238-9.

UNIVERSITIES (WITH 90 OR MORE POSITIONS ON FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES)

Institution	Rank	Number
University of California	1	394
University of Texas	2	160
Harvard University	3	140
University of Washington	4	123
University of Michigan	5	118
Johns Hopkins	6	114
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	7	113
University of Wisconsin	8	104
State University of New York	9	101
Yale University	10	100
Columbia University	11	96
Stanford University	12	96
University of Illinois	13	93
University of Minnesota	14	93

Cornell Prof. Gets NSF Post

James A. Krumhansl, professor of physics at Cornell, has been nominated to be the National Science Foundation's assistant director for mathematical and physical sciences and engineering. The post, a presidential appointment subject to Senate confirmation, was formerly held by Edward C. Creutz, who resigned to become head of the Bishop Museum in Honolulu.

Krumhansl's appointment fills the last vacancy in NSF's seven-member echelon of assistant directors, a level just below the deputy directorship of the Foundation.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106